

Appl. No. : 10/029,721
Filed : December 20, 2001

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to clarify the invention. Claim 4 has been amended to change the dependencies and Claim 8 has been amended to confirm to the U.S. practice. Support for the amendments to Claims 1 and 10 can be found on page 4, line 8 and page 10, line 2 of the specification, for example. Claim 3 has been canceled without prejudice. Claims 13-15 have been added. Accordingly, Claims 1, 2 and 4-15 are pending in this application. The amendments do not constitute the addition of any new matter to the specification. Applicant respectfully requests entry of the amendments and reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the following remarks.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and § 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-5, 10 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Suzuki (U.S. 2002/0150722 A1). Claims 2, 6-9 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (U.S. 2002/0150722 A1). The claims as amended herein patentably distinguish over the reference as explained below. Claims 1 and 10 are independent and the remaining claims are ultimately dependent on either Claim 1 or 10.

Claims 1 and 10 have been amended to recite that a surface fine concavo-convex structure is formed by particles having a particle size of 2 to 5 μm , and an average of center line surface roughness (Ra) satisfies the equation: $0.1 \leq \text{Ra} \leq 0.17\mu\text{m}$.

As shown in the table below, Examples 1 and 2 of the present application fulfill the limitations of the amended Claim 1 and show advantageous effects (no glare), as compared with Examples 3 and 4 which do not fulfill the above specific Ra of the amended Claim 1.

	Particle Size (μm)	Ra	Glare
Ex. 1	3.5	0.150	No glare
Ex. 2	3.5	0.120	No glare
Ex. 3	3.5	0.240	A little glare
Ex. 4	3.5	0.220	A little glare

Suzuki never discloses examples which fulfill all limitations of the amended Claim 1 as shown in the following table.

Appl. No. : 10/029,721
Filed : December 20, 2001

	Particle Size (um)	Ra
Ex. 1	1.3	0.174
Ex. 2	1.3	0.185
Ex. 3	1.3	0.197
Ex. 4	1.3/1.5	0.167
Ex. 5	3.5	0.186
Ex. 6	5	0.230
Ex. 7	4	0.191

Examples 5-7 of Suzuki are similar to Examples 3 and 4 disclosed in the present application, and Ra of each example is over 0.17 μm . In Examples 1-4, the particle size is less than 2 μm , and in Examples 1-3, Ra is over 0.17 μm . In order to obtain the above unexpected advantages, it is important to meet the significant features of i) a surface fine concavo-convex structure is formed by particles having a particle size of 2 to 5 μm , and ii) an average of center line surface roughness (Ra) satisfies the equation: $0.1 \leq \text{Ra} \leq 0.17\mu\text{m}$. That is, no glare is achieved by reducing Ra ($0.1 \leq \text{Ra} \leq 0.17\mu\text{m}$) by using relatively large particles (2 to 5 μm). Suzuki is clearly not aware of such configurations.

Accordingly, Claims 1 and 10 and the claims dependent on either Claim 1 or 10 could not be anticipated by or obvious over the reference. Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections.

Patentability of Claims 6 and 13

Claim 6, dependent on Claim 1, recites the distinct features of Claim 1, and additionally recites the use of a low refractive index layer. Also, Claim 13, dependent on Claim 10, recites the distinct features of Claim 10, and additionally recites the use of a low refractive index layer. Thus, at least for the reasons mentioned above, Claims 6 and 13 also could not be anticipated by or obvious over the reference. Further, in these claims, the low refractive index layer has a refractive index lower than a refractive index of the resin coated layer (or anti-glare outermost layer) and is disposed on concavo-convex structure surface of the resin coated layer (or anti-glare outermost layer). The low refractive index layer is very effective to lower glossiness as demonstrated in the examples of the present application. Suzuki does not even suggest the low

Appl. No. : 10/029,721
Filed : December 20, 2001

refractive index layer. Thus, in particular, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 6 and 13 are allowable.

CONCLUSION

In light of the Applicant's foregoing Remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any remaining concerns which might prevent the prompt allowance of the application, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below.

Please charge any additional fees, including any fees for additional extension of time, or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-1410. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,
KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: June 30, 2003

By:



Katsuhiro Arai
Registration No. 43,315
Agent of Record
(949) 760-0404

H:\DOCS\TOS\UNIU47.001AUS.AMEND.DOC/062403